

Should the Examiner instead assert that Claims 26-31 are drawn to a process, Applicants respectfully submit that those claims are indeed "drawn to the originally elected invention".

The Examiner goes on in paragraph "5" to state that Claims 26-31 are objected to for "failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim". Applicants respectfully submit that each of those claims includes subject matter not found in the parent claim. For example, the "plurality of disk-shaped blanks of varied thickness... separated at a right angle to an axis of the compact" recited in Claim 26 is not found in parent Claim 18. Moreover, as stated in the Manual Of Patent Examining Procedure § 608.01(n)(III.), last paragraph, "if claim 1 recites a specific product, a claim for the method of making the product of claim 1 in a particular manner would be a proper dependent claim...".

Should the Examiner instead require election of the subject matter of Group I or Group II, Applicants elect Group I, with traverse. The traversal is on the grounds that Claim 18 is allowable for the reasons discussed in the previous response. Thus, subject matter common to both groups of claims is new, and the requirements for lack of unity of invention under PCT Rule 13.2 are not met.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any

remaining issues pertaining to this application, the Examiner is kindly invited to call the undersigned counsel for Applicants regarding the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: November 24, 2008

By: /Peter T. deVore/  
Peter T. deVore  
Registration No. 60361

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703 836 6620